



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/543,330

04/05/2000

Julie Rac Kowald

169.1658

6705

5514

7590

07/09/2007

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

ONUAKU, CHRISTOPHER O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/09/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/543,330

**Applicant(s)**

KOWALD, JULIE RAE

**Examiner**

Christopher Onuaku

**Art Unit**

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-20, 22-53 and 55-71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 5-7, 9, 12, 13, 16-20, 22, 23, 27, 30-37, 39, 42-53 and 55-71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 4, 8, 10, 14, 15, 24, 25, 28, 29, 38, 40 and 41 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/7/07 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 5/7/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. Applicant argues that the examiner reads the presently claimed term of "template with cutting rules" as a "editing list which contains the editing rules for creating the edited output.", and that the examiner reads "cutting rules" as "the editing rules which include, for example, the beginning and end times of each clip". The applicant continues, that as understood, the reference to the "editing list" is a reference to the "edited list", then the output of Ohmori is erroneously equated with the template of the present invention. And that if that understanding of that reference is incorrect, then the

Art Unit: 2621

"editing list" can at best be the "clip list" which can not define editing or cutting rules, since any such rules are what would be used to act on the list. The list itself can not be the rules, the applicant concludes.

In response, the term "template with cutting rules" is read by the examiner as the editing list which contains the editing rules for creating the edited output. The examiner reads cutting rules as the editing rules which include, for example, the beginning and end times of each clip. In col.11, line 27 to col.12, line 5, Ohmori discloses that an operator can use the edited-list creating part 35 on the main screen 30 with the list of registered clips displayed at the clip information display part 32 on the main screen 30 (Fig.5) to create an edited list. Then Ohmori goes on to disclose how an edited list is created using the list of registered clips (template) displayed at the clip information display part 32 on the main screen 30 of Fig.5.

It is pertinent to point out that what in effect the applicant is claiming is the editing of some "raw" footage clips using some desired editing "rules" to produce a desired final edited clip, which is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art; and which is what Ohmori discloses. Editing rules would include, for example, how to determine the beginning and end of each clip, which clip(s) to insert or combine with which other clip(s), etc.

Furthermore, applicant argues that Ohmori discloses a manual method of editing that is assisted by a computer interface whereas the claim cites a "computer-implementable method"

Art Unit: 2621

In response, the applicant is referred to at least col.17, line 41 to col.19, line 67 where Ohmori discloses where the CPU 20 (computing means) is performing the edit-processing function, using a computing-executable means. Examiner reads "computer-implementable method" as a method that can be implemented by using a computing means, which Ohmori discloses in CPU 20. Moreover, it is well known that to make a process automatic would have been well within the routine skill of the artisan in the art. In re Venner, 120 USPQ 192 (CCPA 1958).

The applicant's arguments are not persuasive. The rejections are, therefore, maintained.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1,2,5-7,9,12,13,16-18,22,23,27,30-33,39,42-44&71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ohmori et al (US 6,292,620).

Regarding claims 1,22&35, Ohmori et al disclose an edited-list creating apparatus, an editing apparatus and an editing method capable of creating a so-called edited list in which the edit content is defined for obtaining a desired edited image and

Art Unit: 2621

sound, for example, by linking a plurality of pre-registered image and sound materials (clips) together in a desired state, comprising computer-implementable method of editing a video sequence (see Fig.1,2&3; CPU 20 of main control section 3, at least col.9, lines 8-15, where the CPU 20 processing reads on the claimed computer-implementable method of editing ; extracting duration data associated with the duration of each clip of the video sequence (col.9, line 49 to col.10, line 37); providing at least one predetermined template, the template having a plurality of attributes including cutting (editing) rules comprising at least a plurality of predetermined edited segment durations (see Fig.5, and registered clips displayed at the clip information part 32 on the main screen 30; col.11, lines 27-31); processing the duration data of the at least one clip according to cutting rules of the template to form editing instruction data, the editing instruction data being configured to form output edited segments from the at least one clip (see Fig.5; col.11, line 32 to col.12, line 5; and processing the at least one clip of the video sequence according to the editing instruction data to form an output edited sequence of the output edited segments, each output edited segment having a duration corresponding to one of the plurality of predetermined edited segment durations of the cutting rules of the template, with at least a portion of the at least one clip being discarded by the processing of the at least one clip (see at least col.14, lines 10-35), and as shown in Fig. 5 is the claimed template or the list of registered clips displayed at the clip information display part 32 on the main screen 30 of Fig.5).

Regarding claims 2,7&23, Ohmori et al disclose wherein the editing rules

Art Unit: 2621

establish a cutting format that provides for formation of the output edited segments each being of one of a first duration and a second duration (see col.10, lines 24-37); and wherein an initial interval of a predetermined (third) duration is discarded from each of the clip prior to formation of the edited segments from a remainder of the clips (see col.14, lines 10-35).

Regarding claims 5,6&43, Ohmori et al disclose wherein the output edited sequence is formed from a time sequential combination of the out edited segments based upon a predetermined cutting pattern formed using segments of the first duration and the second duration (FIG.5)', wherein the predetermined cutting pattern comprises alternate first duration segments and second duration segments (col.10, line 24 to col.11, line 26).

Regarding claim 9, Ohmori et al disclose an internal interval of a predetermined (fourth) duration is discarded from at least one clip from which at least two of the output edited segments are to be formed, the internal interval separating portions of a clip from which the at least two output edited segments are formed (see col.14, lines 10-M; and Fig.5).

Regarding claims 12,13,27&39, Ohmori et al disclose that the formation of the output edited segments comprises cutting a portion from at least one clip and modifying a reproduction duration of the portion to correspond with one of the first duration and the

Art Unit: 2621

second duration, wherein the cutting and the modifying are performed when the portion has a reproduction duration within a predetermined range of one of the first and second durations (col.16, line 42 to col.17, line 5., also col.5, lines 20-26 and col.7, lines 5-10).

Regarding claims 16,30&42, Ohmori et al disclose that the editing rules comprise an edited duration during which the output edited segments are to be reproduced and from which a number of the output edited segments is determined based on the first and second durations (col.10, line 24 to col.11 , line 7).

Regarding claims 17&32, Ohmori et al disclose wherein each of the plurality of predetermined edited segment duration are determined using a beat period of a soundtrack to be associated with the output edited sequence (col.11, line 63 to col.12, line 5).

Regarding claim 18, Ohmori et al disclose wherein the duration data comprises data accompanying the video sequence (Fig.5 and col.10, lines 24-37).

Regarding claim 31, the limitations of claim 31 were discussed in the art rejection of claim 6.

Regarding claim 33, Ohmori et al disclose wherein the duration data comprises data selected from the group consisting of data accompanying the video sequence, and

Art Unit: 2621

data formed by analyzing the video sequence, the analyzing comprising at least one of time analysis, image analysis, sound analysis and motion analysis (col.10, lines 24-60).

Regarding claim 44, the limitations of claim 44 were discussed in the art rejection of claim 31.

Regarding claim 71, Ohmori et al disclose that the one template is selected from a plurality of templates each comprising different combinations of editing rules (see Fig.5; col.11, line 27 to col.13, line 7; and col.5, lines 20-26 and col.7, lines 5-10).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmori et al in view of Nakatani et al (US 5,784,521).

Regarding claim 19, Ohmori et al fail to disclose wherein the editing rules include incorporating at least one title matte as part of the output edited sequence.

Nakatani et al teach incorporating a title (Fig.6E-6F). Further, it is well known in the art to incorporate a title on a matte background.

It would have been highly desirable to insert a title in the video so that the video

Art Unit: 2621

segments can be identified by the viewer. For example, if the edited segment is a movie, then the title of the movie can be inserted.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a title matte in the device of Ohmori et al

8. Claims 20,34,45-48,55-57&63-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmori et al in view of Nakatani et al and further in view of Yaegashi et al (US 5,956,453).

Regarding claims 20,34&45, Ohmori et al disclose wherein the title matte is formed and incorporated according to a sub-method comprising the steps of examining the time data associated with the duration data for each clip to identify those of the clips that are associable by a predetermined time function, the associable clips being arranged into corresponding groups of clips, and identifying at least a beginning and a conclusion (see Fig.5; col.11, line 26 to col.13, line 7). However, Ohmori et al fail to disclose identifying at least one title location, and incorporating the inserted title.

Yaegashi et al teach grouping associable clips (CUTS) into corresponding groups of clips (SCENE, Fig.6B); and identifying at least one of a beginning (605) and a conclusion (611) of each group as a title location.

Nakatani et al teach inserting the title into the sequence, as discussed previously. Since Yaegashi et al separates the video into separate scenes, using the text feature of Nakatani et al title data can be inserted by examining at least one of corresponding time data and further characteristic data to generate the insert title including at least a text

Art Unit: 2621

component (e.g., "scene 1").

It would have been highly desirable to organize the clips as shown in Fig.6B so that the device generates an automated grouping of cuts, scenes, and motion pictures. Since the cuts are set by the device, the user does not have to go through the process of setting cuts manually.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to organize the clips as described above, and insert titles in the device of Ohmori et al.

Regarding claims 46,55&63, the claimed limitations of claims 46,55&63 are accommodated in the discussions of claim 1 above. Furthermore, Ohmori et al teach examining the time data for each clip to identify those of the clips that are associable by a predetermined time function, the associable clips being arranged into corresponding groups of clips (col.10, lines 34-60; and for each group of clips identifying at least one of a beginning and a conclusion of each said group as a title location (Fig.5). However, Ohmori et al fail to disclose for at least one title location, examining at least one of corresponding time data and further data to generate an insert title including at least a text component; and incorporating the insert title into the video sequence at a corresponding title location.

Nakatani et al teach inserting the title into the sequence and Yaegashi et al teach grouping cuts into scenes, as discussed previously. Since Yaegashi et al separate the video into separate scenes, using the text feature of Nakatani et al, title data can be

inserted corresponding to time data and further data (e.g., "scene 1").

It would have been highly desirable to organize the clips as shown in Fig.6B so that the device generates an automated grouping of cuts, scenes, and motion pictures. Since the cuts are set by the device, the user does not have to go through the process of setting cuts manually. It would have been highly desirable to insert titles in the sequence corresponding to time data and further data so that scene numbers and cut numbers can be inserted into the video so that the editor easily recognizes scenes and cuts, thereby making editing easier.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to organize the clips as described above, and insert titles in the device of Ohmori et al.

Regarding claims 47, 56 and 64, Yaegashi et al further teach wherein the predetermined time function comprises associating any two sequential clips within a group when a period between a real-time conclusion of one of the sequential clips and the real-time commencement of a following clip is less than a predetermined (first) duration (col.3, line 25 to col.4, line 2). Since Yaegashi et al teach an editing device that allows the user to change cuts as desired (col.3, line 25 to col.4, line 2), the user can associate any two sequential clips within a group when the period between the real time conclusion of one said clip and the real time commencement of the following said clip is less than a predetermined first duration.

Regarding claims 48, 57 and 65, Ohmori et al fail to disclose wherein the further

Art Unit: 2621

data comprises user provided data.

Yaegashi et al disclose an editing device that allows the user to change cuts as desired (col.3, line 25 to col.4, line 2). Therefore, the user can associate any two sequential clips within a group when the period between the real time conclusion of one said clip and the real time commencement of the following said clip is less than a predetermined first duration. Since the user can set cuts, the further data is considered to be provided by the user (Fig.5).

It would have been highly desirable to have user provided data so that the user can edit the cuts in the case that commercial segments have been missed or improperly identified.

Therefore, it would have been highly desirable to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a user provided data in the device of Ohmori et al .

9. Claims 36&37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmori et al.

Regarding claim 36, Ohmori et al disclose wherein the supply means comprises a storage arrangement configured to couple the video sequence to the extracting means (see Fig.1, 2&3, video tape recorders 14A to 14D of Fig.1, in-point specifying means 45 and out-point specifying means 46., col.10, lines 18-37).. wherein the output means comprises at least one of a display device by which the output edited sequence is viewable and a further storage arrangement for storing the output edited sequence

Art Unit: 2621

(see inimage display part 44; in-point image display part 47 and out-point display part 48 of clip edit window 40 of Fig.4.

Regarding claim 37, Ohmori et al further disclose wherein the duration data comprises metadata, the extracting means forming a metadata file of the video sequence based upon each clip, and the metadata file forming an input to the processing means (col.11, lines 27-31), and wherein at least the processing means comprises a computer device operable to interpret the metadata file according to the editing rules to form the editing instruction data (see Fig.2 and CPU 20).

10. Claims 49,50,58,59,66&67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmori et al in view of Nakatani et al, and Yaegashi et al and further in view of Yoshida (US 5,515,101).

Regarding claims 49, 50, 58, 59, 66 and 67, Ohmori et al, Nakatani et al, and Yaegashi et al fail to disclose the method wherein the further data comprises generated data formed by analyzing a corresponding clip and step (c) comprises examining at least one of the time data and the further data to select from a rule-based group of alternatives at least one title component from a title database, the at least one title component collectively forming the insert title.

Yoshida teaches further data comprising generated data formed by analyzing the corresponding said clip and examining the data to select from a rule-based group of alternatives at least one title component from a title database, the title components

Art Unit: 2621

collectively the inserted titles (col.7-9), wherein the title components are selected from the group consisting of individual words or phrases (col.7-9), the title components being configured for selecting in response to rule-based examination of the data.

It would have been highly desirable to select a title from a title database so that the titles do not have to be generated by the user; and commonly used titles are easily available.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select titles consisting of individual words or phrases from a title database in the device of Ohmori et al so that the titles do not have to be generated by the user; and commonly used titles are easily available.

11. Claims 51-53, 60-62 & 68-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmori et al in view of Nakatani et al, Yaegashi et al and Yoshida and further in view of Miyazaki et al (US 6,546,187).

Regarding claims 51-53, 60-62 & 68-70, Ohmori et al, Nakatani et, Yaegashi et al and Yoshida fail to disclose wherein the title database comprises a plurality of typeset configurations applicable to the at least one title component to modify a visual impact of the insert title and a graphical database of graphical objects configured for inclusion in the insert title; and a matte background permitting superimposition of the insert title upon a clip.

Miyazaki et al teach a title database with a graphical database of graphical objects configured for inclusion in the inserted title (Fig.6-9); a plurality of typeset

Art Unit: 2621

configurations applicable to the title components to modify a visual impact of the inserted title (Fig.6-9); and a matte background permitting the superimposition of the inserted title upon the clip (Fig.6-9).

It would have been highly desirable to have the graphical objects, typeset configurations, and a matte background so that the user has a plurality of options to select from to make clips more interesting.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a plurality of typeset configurations, graphical objects, and a matte background in the device of Ohmori et al.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

12. Claims 3,4,8,10,14,15,24,25,28,29,38,40&41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Conclusion***

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher Onuaku whose telephone number is 571-272-7379. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

COO

4/24/07

6/22/07



**JOHN MILLER**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**